



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,549	11/28/2001	Ernie F. Brickell	10559-505001/P8790X	7968
20985	7590	10/01/2003	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE SUITE 500 SAN DIEGO, CA 92122			ELISCA, PIERRE E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/998,549

Applicant(s)

Ernie F. Brickell et al.

Examiner

Pierre E. Elisca

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (e). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/21/2003
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-34, and 36-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-34, AND 36-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 9
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(e). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3621

**DETAILED ACTION**  
**RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT**

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment, filed on 07/21/2003.
2. Claims 17 and 35 are canceled, Claims 1-16, 18-34, and 36-40 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 (b)***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-16, 18-34, and 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Gasser et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,224,163).

**As per claims 1, 3-16, 20-23, 25-34, and 38-40 Gasser** discloses a method/system for delegating authorization from one entity in a distributed computing system to another for a computing session, wherein a session public/private encryption key pair is utilized for each computing session (which is readable as Applicant's claimed invention wherein it is stated that receiving from a delegator), comprising:

receiving, from a delegator, a designation of a role and a delegate to assume the role (see., abstract, col 3, lines 7-48);

**Art Unit: 3621**

receiving, from a credential service provider, an indication that the designation is valid (see., abstract, col 3, lines 26-48, specifically wherein it is stated that if the user's name is found on the list next to the requested access, access will be granted, col 6, lines 33-66); and issuing a delegation credential in response to receiving the indication (see., col 3, lines 7-48, specifically wherein it is stated that if the user's name is found on the list next to the requested access, access will be granted). Applicant's newly added limitation wherein said send a message to the delegator indicating that the delegation credential has been assigned is also disclosed by Gasser in the abstract, col 3, lines 7-48, specifically wherein it is stated that delegating authorization from one entity in a distributed computing system. A private key enables each entity to identify itself to other entities and to encode certain message. When a user requests access to a system resource, the user's name is compared to the resource's access control list. If the user's name is found on the list next to the requested access, access will be granted (granted or credential has been assigned).

**As per claims 2, and 24, Gasser** discloses the claimed method wherein the delegation credential comprises encoded delegation information (see., col 3, lines 7-15, col 5, lines 42-68).

**As per claims 18, and 36, Gasser** discloses the claimed method of storing the delegation credential in a database maintained by a delegation service provider (see., col 3, lines 7-15, specifically wherein it is stated that public key are stored with the entities names in a global naming service).

**Art Unit: 3621**

**As per claims 19, and 37, Gasser** discloses the claimed method wherein identifying comprises checking a hash of the confirmation code to identify the delegator (see., col 5, lines 10-67, specifically wherein it is stated that RSA cryptography or has function).

### **REMARKS**

5. In response to Applicant's arguments, Applicant argues that the prior art of record (Gasser) taken alone or in combination fails to show how issuing a delegation credential is equivalent to granting access to a resource. Examiner respectfully disagrees since Gasser discloses a delegating authorization from one entity in a distributing system. Each entity on the distributed is given a unique name and a private key/public key for encoding and decoding certain messages, and therefore, delegation credential is readable as access rights or granting access to a certain messages. Applicant should duly note that the delegation authorization of Gasser is based on a unique name and also on a private key/public key, accordingly, delegation credential is equivalent to granting access to a resource or message.

Furthermore, Applicant argues that Gasser does not mention "outstanding delegation requests much less a request for outstanding requests". As stated in the Office action mailed on 05/05/2003, Gasser discloses when a user makes a request of a resource or message, the reference monitor (i.e., the manager of access to the resource ) looks for the requesting user on that resources access control list. If the user's name id found (or membership in a group is verified), the requested access is granted.

**Art Unit: 3621**

Please note that the requesting user on that resource access control list or membership ID in a group is readable as outstanding delegation requests. Therefore, Applicant arguments are moot.

***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Pierre Eddy Elisca at (703) 305-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 6:30AM. to 5:00PM.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

The Official Fax Number For TC-3600 is:

**(703) 305-7687**

  
Pierre Eddy Elisca

Patent Examiner

**September 30, 2003**